

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Anthony Gene Trappier,	)	
	)	Civil Action No.: 5:12-1159-TLW-KDW
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Dr. David Crawford, MD, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

On May 1, 2012, the Plaintiff, Anthony Gene Trappier ("Plaintiff"), *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this civil action proceeding under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). (Doc. # 1).

The matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. # 13). The Magistrate Judge also recommends that Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction be denied. Id. The Plaintiff filed two documents in the nature of objections to the Report. The first is styled a "Motion to Amend" while the second is styled "Objection and Response." (Docs. # 15 and # 16). In conducting its review, the Court therefore applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to

those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the Plaintiff's objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. # 13). The complaint is therefore **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Doc. # 4) and Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. # 15) are denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

June 18, 2012  
Florence, South Carolina

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge